Educ.

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BULLETIN: ERB

DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
SEP 20 1960
DURHAM, N. C.

SEPTEMBER 14, 1960

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Vol. XXXIX, No. 6

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BULLETIN

(Entered in the United States Patent Office)

R. H. ECKELBERRY.....*Editor*
SHIRLEY LIPSON.....*Assistant Editor*

PUBLISHED BY THE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SERVICE, AS AN ORGAN OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, FOR THE SCHOOLS OF OHIO. EDITORIAL OFFICE, ROOM 173; BUSINESS OFFICE, ROOM 195, ARPS HALL, COLUMBUS 10, OHIO

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION ONE DOLLAR ($1) TO PERSONS LIVING OUTSIDE OHIO

CONTENTS

Airborne Television: an Educational Experiment..... 141
SHIRLEY LIPSON

Matching Quantity with Quality in Education..... 148
JOHN E. IVEY, JR.

The Inside Story of a Bright Child..... 155
ALLEN BERGER

Editorial Comment..... 157

Readings 160
The Miami Years, 1809–1959; Research in the Three R's; An Introduction to Educational Research; Personnel Services in Catholic Four Year Colleges for Women; Factors That Influence Learning; What Education Has to Learn from Psychology; Work in the Lives of Married Women; Proceedings of a Conference on Womanpower; The Alive and Growing Teacher; Training for Social Work: Third International Survey.

THE EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH BULLETIN is published monthly except during June, July, and August. Entered as Second-Class Matter, February 9, 1922, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Accepted for mailing at specified rates of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized February 21, 1922.

Educational Research Bulletin

SEPTEMBER 14, 1960
Vol. XXXIX, No. 6

Airborne Television: an Educational Experiment[1]

By SHIRLEY LIPSON

NOTE.—The editors believe that airborne educational television is highly significant and has possible implications for the classrooms of the future. A large part of two issues of the BULLETIN will, therefore, be devoted to it. An Airborne Television Workshop was held at Ohio State University, July 25–29, 1960. Three of the speeches delivered at this Workshop will be included in the September and October issues of the BULLETIN. "Matching Quantity with Quality in Education," by John E. Ivey, Jr., appears this month. Speeches made by I. Keith Tyler and Egon G. Guba will be published in October.

As SCHOOL enrollments continue to spiral at an alarming rate, educators will depend increasingly upon technological aids. Television has already become an accepted part of classroom instruction, and experiments with various teaching machines are being carried out. As needs become greater, innovations and experiments can be expected with greater frequency.

Among the newer experimental projects is the Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction. Although its basic instruction plan is not unlike those already in existence, it is new in two senses: its television antenna will operate high above the ground and it will introduce a regional concept into educational-television coverage. Both of these innovations result from the basic objective of the new program: to provide more students with instruction of high quality at a relatively low cost.

Elevating the "station" several miles above the earth makes

[1] Factual information on the project was taken from the *Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction*, a brochure prepared by the Program staff; the Airborne Television Workshop held at Ohio State University; and an interview with I. Keith Tyler, director of the Workshop. Copies of the brochure are available from Program headquarters, Memorial Center, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

reception possible over a much wider geographic area. Many children in small towns and rural areas who attend schools with inadequate staff and facilities and who are beyond the telecasting limits of ground-based educational-television stations should benefit significantly. Extending coverage to a regional area makes such expansion economically feasible.

BASICALLY the program calls for an airplane telecasting educational courses on video tape over a six-state area. The plane, a DC6AB, will fly at an altitude of 23,000 feet over north central Indiana. A second aircraft, based some distance away, will serve as a stand-by. It is estimated that flights will be possible about 98 per cent of the time. The telecasts will cover a circular area 300 miles in diameter and encompassing parts of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Transmission will be on standard-band, ultra high–frequency channels, and, experimentally, on narrow-band frequencies. Westinghouse Electric Corporation and CBS Laboratories, Inc., have technical responsibility for the airborne program. The project will cost approximately seven million dollars: the Ford Foundation has appropriated four and one-half million, and private industry will contribute the remainder. Schools will purchase equipment that they require. Throughout the experimental period, an effort will be made to ensure permanent financial support after June, 1962.

Those who have planned and engineered this project know that airborne telecasting is feasible. Westinghouse Electric Corporation demonstrated this in a three-year experiment soon after World War II. The signal from an airborne transmitter operating at 25,000 feet was received as far away as 225 miles, where terrain was favorable.

Because of its comprehensiveness, the project has been termed an "exercise in co-operation."[2] It was planned and developed by a Council of fifteen[3] with the aid of various advisory committees, a curriculum committee, a teacher-screening panel, and a

[2] Shibler, Herman L. (Director, Educational Division), in a talk given July 25 at the Ohio State University Airborne Television Workshop.

[3] The following are Council members: Samuel M. Brownell, Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Michigan; Walker L. Cisler, President, Detroit Edison Company; Floyd Fairman, President, Kentucky Utilities Company; Novice G. Fawcett, President, Ohio State University; John Guy Fowlkes, Professor, School of Education, University of Wisconsin; Lyman V. Ginger, Dean, College of Education, University of Kentucky; Edward E. Holt, Director of Education and State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Columbus, Ohio; Frederick L. Hovde, President, Purdue University; Eugene W. Kettering, formerly Vice-President and Director of Research, Electro-Motive Division, General Motors; William Douglas McIntyre, President, Board of Regents of State Colleges, Eau Claire,

number of consultants. All of the persons involved have specialized abilities in various areas ranging from curriculum and classroom teaching to airplane technology and television production. Thus the total program has been conceived through the co-operative efforts of numerous individuals outstanding in their fields.

THE curriculum has not been imposed "from above" but was developed from discussions at the grass-roots level. The Curriculum Policy and Planning Committee is composed of leading educators from each of the six states involved in the program, curriculum experts from all levels of education, and persons thoroughly familiar with the needs of the various school systems. Moreover, they have consulted widely with school personnel in the Midwest. The resulting list of courses appears on pages 144–45.

To select the teachers, an intensive nationwide "teacher talent search" was conducted to find those who are most outstanding. In workshops held during the past summer, the teachers selected have been preparing the courses for airborne television. Their activities have included development of course outlines, supplementary written materials, and graphic aids; research; and consultation with subject-matter and curriculum specialists in the six-state area to be sure that each course falls within the curriculum specifications of the states involved. After course preparation has been completed, actual recording work will begin.

The period from spring, 1960, through June, 1962, might be considered the developmental stage of the program preceding establishment of a permanent organization. In the spring and summer of this year, there was an intensive series of preparations; some of these have already been discussed. In the summer some workshops were held for the classroom teachers, principals, and superintendents who will use the telecasts. The remainder of these will be concluded by November. In late November or December of this year, airborne test patterns for receiver installations will begin. Actual telecasting will start January 30, 1961, and will extend through June, 1961. This will be a demonstration period during which schools may observe the telecasts, check the

Wisconsin; Mrs. Russell Moore, Past President, Ohio PTA Congress, Member, Advisory Committee on Curriculum and Teaching, Ohio State Board of Education; John W. Taylor, Executive Director, Chicago Educational Television Association; Louis A. Weil, Jr., Editor and Publisher, *Lafayette Journal and Courier;* Herman B. Wells, President, Indiana University; Benjamin C. Willis, General Superintendent of Schools, Chicago, Illinois, President, Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association.

quality of reception, and begin installing and testing their classroom equipment. In the summer of 1961, in-service workshops will again be held. The first full academic year of telecasts will extend from September, 1961, through May, 1962.

INITIALLY courses will be presented over two channels; this will provide for twenty-four half-hour units of instruction in a six-hour school day. It is hoped, however, that the airborne system will eventually be expanded to six channels and thus provide seventy-two units of instruction. If this plan is carried out, a considerable portion of the elementary- and high-school curriculum could be provided by television. (A typical twelve-grade school system offers between 100 and 175 separate courses.) A certain amount of program repetition at different hours will allow greater flexibility of scheduling for individual schools. Possibly special advanced-standing courses and in-service programs for teachers might also be telecast.

The initial curriculum of courses is as follows:

ELEMENTARY-SCHOOL		
*Science, Grades III–IV	4 da/wk	20 min
*Science, Grades V–VI	" "	" "
Social Studies, Grades III–IV	" "	" "
Social Studies, Grades V–VI	" "	" "
Arithmetic, Grade III	" "	" "
*Arithmetic, Grade VI	" "	" "
Language Arts, Grades III–IV	" "	" "
Language Arts, Grades V–VI	" "	" "
Beginning Spanish, Grades III–VI	" "	" "
Spanish for Elementary-School Teachers	1 da/wk	15 min
*Beginning French, Grades III–VI	4 da/wk	20 min
French for Elementary-School Teachers	1 da/wk	15 min
*Art, Grades I–III	2 da/wk	20 min
*Art, Grades IV–VI	" "	" "
*Music, Grades I–III	" "	" "
*Music, Grades IV–VI	" "	" "
SECONDARY-SCHOOL		
General Science for Junior High	4 da/wk	30 min
*Physics for Senior High	" "	" "
Biology for Senior High (AIBS Films)	" "	" "
*American History for Senior High	" "	" "
*World History & Geography	" "	" "
*American Government & Civics	" "	" "
Beginning Spanish for Junior High	" "	" "
*American Literature and Composition	" "	" "
Guidance for Junior & Senior High	1 da/wk	" "

COLLEGE

Mathematics (Continental Classroom—Film)	5 da/wk	30 min
*Chemistry (Continental Classroom—Film)	" "	" "
College Russian	4 da/wk	" "

*Indicates courses to be offered during the trial period.

School systems beyond the coverage area may receive these courses by means of video tape or retelecasts on local educational-television stations.

Various plans have been developed to help teachers make the best use of the telecast courses. A number of colleges and universities in the six-state area will serve as resource institutions to all participating schools. In Ohio the designated resource centers are Bowling Green, Miami, and Ohio State Universities. At each institution there will be an area co-ordinator[4] and a committee consisting of school and university educators and administrators, educational-television representatives, and appropriate lay personnel. Briefly, the committee in each area will act as liaison between the central staff and the local schools and colleges, help distribute pertinent information about the program, arrange for in-service training and workshops and seminars for school personnel, and plan for evaluation of the telecasts. In addition to these services, classroom teachers will have more specific aids in the form of manuals, syllabuses, supplemental textbooks, and other materials to be made available by the project staff.

Participation in the project will be on a voluntary basis. Each school system that wishes to take part will require certain basic equipment. The cost will depend upon the schools' proximity to the aircraft and the kind of installation that is desired. A detailed discussion of costs, with accompanying charts and diagrams, appears in the Midwest Program brochure (*see* note, page 141).

In brief this is the program. Its proponents make no claims that it will replace traditional educational-television instruction. Although they envision the present project as possibly becoming a pilot program for similar regional undertakings which could eventually lead to coast-to-coast educational-television coverage maintained by a small number of airplanes, they also recognize the value of ground-based and closed-circuit systems:

The single channel, ground-based ETV station and the multichannel closed circuit system each has its role to play in the full

[4]The Ohio co-ordinators are: Bowling Green State University—Fred B. Williams, Instructor in Education; Miami University—Jack R. Neill, Associate Professor of Education; Ohio State University—William H. Ewing, Associate Director of Programing, Radio and Television Broadcasting.

development of instructional television, regionally and nationally. Each adds an element of flexibility to the service provided by a regional airborne system. Different schedules can be followed. Local needs and professional planning more sensitively can strengthen the regional airborne program.[5]

WHETHER or not the project succeeds depends upon many factors: the attitudes of school personnel and the public, the use that is made of the telecasts, and the solution of various problems—both those that have been foreseen and others that assuredly will appear. There are the more mundane, but ticklish, problems of time-zone differences and scheduling difficulties. Many supervisors will have to become public-relations men as they try to sell the program to their communities. Certainly budgetary considerations are not to be minimized, and supervisors will have to be able to justify purchases of new equipment. Doubtless the problems and their severity will vary from school to school, but there are certain broad problems with serious implications for the future that should be examined by all.

The most serious one, perhaps, deals with clarification of the role of the classroom teacher. Anxieties long associated with educational television have already been expressed in connection with the airborne program. The screen, it is feared, will take the place of the teacher. However, educational television should be regarded as a resource for the teacher, not as his replacement. On the other hand, the teacher who is using television instruction ought not to expect to teach exactly as he did before. His function should remain essentially the same—to provide basic instruction for his students—although his methods of performing it will change. Unfortunately some teachers may regard their new role as that of monitor and paper-grader and act accordingly: if the studio teacher presents the lesson, what is left for the classroom teacher to do but maintain discipline, answer questions, and give tests? Such a role might be filled as well by an intelligent lay person. Because the medium is relatively new, dire predictions are understandable. Actually television instruction can provide the classroom teacher with greater opportunity to use his skills and ingenuity than ever before.

The idea of presenting a body of information for general class use is not new. Certainly in high school and even in elementary school, the teacher has always had to present a certain

[5] *Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction*, p. 7.

amount of factual information or introduce new techniques before proceeding with discussion and individualized projects. Textbooks represent a similar kind of generalized information. There seems to be an advantage, then, to relieving the teacher of some of the burden of presentation and freeing him for more individualized work with students. If there is uniformity in television instruction, then it is up to the classroom teacher to be creative. Through the use of audio-visual techniques and more complete resources than many schools have, the studio teacher can concentrate upon developing the most effective way of presenting material. The classroom teacher, then, is free to work more closely with his students. If television is to raise the over-all quality of instruction, teachers must make the best possible use of what it has to offer.

TODAY few regard television, airborne or otherwise, as the panacea for the assorted ills of education. Supervisors and principals ought not to consider the entire airborne program as fully developed and completely usable for their own situations. Courses to be used should be selected with discretion according to the needs of the various schools. All persons involved must remember that the student, not the television set, is the most important factor in the educational process.

The merits of the airborne program can be judged only after it has been put in operation and evaluative studies have been made. From the present vantage point, however, the program seems most impressive. Educational television will at last reach many schools where it has been unavailable before. In broader terms, the project represents a significant effort to raise the quality of education for an ever-growing school population.

•

Matching Quantity with Quality in Education

By JOHN E. IVEY, JR.

Mr. Ivey is president of the Midwest Program on Airborne Television Instruction. The speech that follows was delivered at a dinner meeting, July 26, 1960, as part of the Ohio State University Airborne Television Workshop.

I WANT to talk about three elements in education that raise questions for us. First is the problem of quantity—the number of students who must be educated in the coming years; second, the problem of quality; and third, the problem of research and development as it relates to matching the quantitative needs with qualitative achievements through new resources that can be applied for that purpose.

With regard to quantity, much has been said and written that seems to argue that if somehow we can get through the 1960's with the increased enrollments that are expected, we will have our major problem solved. But what happens when the girl babies born in 1945, '46, and '47 start having their babies in 1967, '68, and '69 and then twenty years later those babies start having their babies in 1987, '88, and '89, and so on ad infinitum? In other words, what we are faced with is not the problem of solving the quantitative aspects of education by 1970. Rather, then, we will have reached a plateau, which will be a brief intermission to prepare for other waves of students that will come successively in twenty or twenty five–year periods as long as the birth rate remains constant. And our population will increase at something approaching a geometric rate over a long period of time until some change occurs in the birth rate.

The planning that is done for taking care of the school and college population that we will have in the 1960's should be reviewed very carefully. We should determine whether it is imaginative and comprehensive enough for those waves of students that will come as long as we can foresee at the present moment. So, while the colleges will double in population by 1970, probably from 3,800,000 to about 6,500,000, depending on whose statistics are used, another wave coming in through the elementary and secondary schools may cause a similar increase by the 1980's. We

must have the type of planning that is imaginative enough to take care of these population increases and still allow for the attainment of higher and higher qualitative standards.

THERE are three major blocks to ensuring higher qualitative achievement in the face of this increase in population. One block is that most of our school systems have a built-in cultural lag in their curriculum: the realities outside the school change faster than the conditions within. A curriculum is created over a long period of time. It is much easier to add to than it is to subtract from. As a result, the number of courses to be offered, the amount of knowledge to be covered, continues to increase quantitatively. We have not found ways of pruning the curriculum and cutting out the irrelevant factors that are carried over a long period of time through our educational system. The curriculum costs money. It requires teachers; it requires buildings; it requires facilities of various sorts. The built-in lag without some pruning device to make what is retained relevant to the needs of students and society, therefore, breeds educational and managerial inefficiency.

A student who starts to school in 1960, as a six-year-old, will be about forty-six years old in the year 2000. Much of his productive life is going to be lived after that time. His ability to function effectively will depend on his facility to adjust and adapt to the conditions in the world from 2000 until his death. Most of the adults who are sixty years old or more today began their education in 1906 or before; the world of reality that they are dealing with is more like the world of reality that they were educated in than the world of 2000 will be for the child starting now.

So the major question in terms of a cultural lag is, How can we provide an educational opportunity of high quality which will allow the student who begins school in 1960 to be able to cope with the realities of the world that he will deal with up to the year 2000 and after instead of having his mental processes and imagination frozen into the structures and premises of the 1960's? In every age every school system and university is faced with this problem—how to alter the realities within the educational system so that the students are trained with the intellectual power to deal with changing realities which will change continually and more rapidly in the future than they have in the past.

The cultural lag is responsible for the size of the curriculum and the problem of irrelevance of much educational effort. The realities of the curriculum must change as rapidly as the realities outside the school with which the youngsters must deal after they complete their formal education.

THERE is a second block to matching quantity and quality that has to be overcome. Many of the premises on which our educational system is based, such as the number of years required for elementary- and secondary-school training, the prescribed pupil-teacher ratio, and the methods of instruction, have had very little scientific exploration. Many of these premises have almost the character of folklore. But these folk beliefs have become the foundation on which we construct the administrative devices and the financial structure for education. They have become frozen into an established pattern and consequently are very difficult to change. Since they have rarely been based on scientific evidence, to question them becomes a matter of arguing philosophies of education rather than the validity of scientific evidence. Even so, by and large our educational practices are based more on philosophical than scientific premises. So, a second block is that the major premises on which we base educational programing are hard to change because in many cases we do not have the scientific evidence as to their validity or we lack suggestions of possible alternatives to current practices.

THERE is a third block to achieving educational quality for larger numbers of students: the technological status of education. For the most part, it has not changed tremendously since the invention of the printing press. Those in charge of education in that period of history believed that movable type was going to destroy the quality of education by creating a changed relationship between the pupil and the teacher. Pupils could study without the help of the teacher. This was going to be detrimental to maintaining quality because the intimate relationship between teacher and pupil would be lost. Of course, this did not happen.

Education is probably the only major profession in the United States that is using the technology of three or four hundred years ago rather than moving ahead as industry, agriculture, and other professions have done. Only the invention of the printing press and the manufacture of books and other printed aids have kept

us from a blackboard-and-chalk technology. Granted, some impudent things like radio, television, films, and teaching machines have begun to rear their heads, but in terms of widespread application in education they have not had much effect.

Thus, one of the blocks to dealing with the qualitative problem in a meaningful way is the fact that we do not have even the acceptance of, or the competence to use, new means of technology. What other major industry in the United States would dare conduct its business without undertaking long-range programs of basic research to make its production and development processes more efficient and its products of higher quality?

I had a meeting not long ago with the president of a major corporation with a gross income of many billions of dollars a year. As a policy, it spends 2 per cent of this in basic research for the purpose of making obsolete its product and even its development process. Practically every industry in the United States has an administrative officer in charge of research and development, who has the responsibility of finding new products and new and more efficient ways of manufacturing those products while improving their quality.

What position would our military establishment be in if we did not spend many billions of dollars a year in research and development to find new ways of killing people and of defending ourselves? We put millions and billions of dollars into missiles, missile systems for the destruction of our enemies, interceptor systems for the defense of this country, and we think nothing of it.

But how much money regularly goes into the budgets of educational institutions and school systems to make obsolete the way the school system operates or to develop new systems of technology that will help in the qualitative adjustment to the educational problem that faces the country? Very little; in many cases no money at all.

The point is, then, to remove these three blocks that I have mentioned. We need a major research and development program in this country aimed at the problem of raising educational quality while reducing the time of the teacher and the student and achieving better application of technological devices at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer.

So we have the specter of numbers and the problems which block consideration of new ways of taking care of them. But

fortunately we have the possibility through research and development for dealing with these numbers in imaginative new ways. These new approaches may allow us to use educational technology to do those things which it can do most effectively. Teachers will do what they can to meet the intimate learning needs of students and deal with the problems that require professional personnel.

This overview of quantity, blocks to quality, and the use of research and development raises two or three problems that must be considered very seriously. One is, What do we expect the role of the student to be in the learning process? We need as many teachers as we do partly because we have a teacher-oriented rather than a student-oriented educational process.

The premise here is that education has a great teaching facility which as yet is unused—the student. We can develop an educational system that tries to produce students who are independent and self-propelled learners, who can work effectively on educational projects by themselves. In this manner we make the teaching power of students, the self-teaching power, become a factor in the learning process. Students who use this power probably are in a stronger intellectual position when they get out of school than those who lean excessively on the supervision of teachers.

Is it possible in the schools and colleges of the future to make independent learners of all students, whether they be fast, average, or slow? Can we work with them so they may learn how to solve their own problems and make them as independent of teachers as is adequate and necessary for their educational development? This question needs a great deal of exploration and involves modifications in many aspects of the total program.

A second question is, How can we limit teachers to professional chores only? How can we best use teachers' aids, clerks, and assistants to relieve the classroom teacher of baby-sitting, putting on coats, doing clerical duties, and the whole gamut of nonprofessional activities that are now required of professional people? An adequate solution to this question would allow the more efficient assignment of professional personnel in accordance with their skills and interests. There would also be major changes in the salaries that would be paid to the ablest teachers.

A third question that needs a great deal of consideration is whether teachers should do work that can be done as well by technological devices. Inadvertently we have let certain psycho-

logical factors enter into assessing the validity of the relationship between the teacher and the pupil. To many people it is a heretical proposal to have a technological device such as television, films, radio, or teaching machines intervene between the teacher and the students. Others would argue that the professional person should not have to do anything that can be done as well by technological device; thus he would be free to do the things that otherwise remain undone or done poorly in helping the student with his learning problems.

The answers to these questions could make a great deal of difference in the way education is organized and administered and in the outcomes of the educational process. All three questions involve changed relationships among the teacher, the students, the technological resources, the physical space that is required, and the financial resources.

However, before any of the blocks to quality can be completely removed or these major questions fully explored, another thing has to come about in our educational operation. The profession of education must be built more firmly on basic research. To accomplish this would put a major burden on the schools of education to develop themselves as centers for basic research in educational processes, organization, and finance. University colleges of education should be able to provide for those in preservice education and for school faculties in service, new sets of principles and facts, validated by scientific evidence, on the processes of teaching, learning, educational administration, and educational economics. We should reach the point where every school of education is a center of basic research and the training ground for research workers. A sizable portion of the budget in each state department of education might be allocated for research and development. The budgets of local school systems should encourage research and experimentation in the local units. If these things were done, then we would be in a position to look at the learning theories, the economic assumptions, and the political and administrative factors which have dominated our educational establishment thus far, and we could set up a policy of continuous change based on scientific evidence.

How does the airborne project fit into these considerations? It is an enterprise dealing with the broad distribution of educational quality and based on the economics of education. Creating a system for distribution of quality over a broad area

at low cost allows education and economics to operate jointly. The airborne project also has a major concern with technological experimentation. But, perhaps equally important, it is going to result in major exploration of public administration.

It is expected that a high-quality signal can be transmitted that will cover a circle three hundred miles in diameter. The telecasts will reach parts of six states—thirteen thousand schools with a potential audience of five million school children. If these technical objectives of the project can be attained, then the only problem remaining is whether the school systems can use the programs in a competent and effective way so that they supplement and add a new resource dimension to their own curriculums.

Finally we have to inquire, How does one create a six-state school district for the purpose of planning, operating, managing, and financing the airborne service on a permanent basis? How can the local school districts and the states assume this responsibility? This is basically a problem in public administration. Should it be approached through the process of interstate compacts? Should it be approached as the establishment of a nonprofit membership corporation? Or would a combination of the two be best? The creation of a six-state school district for the purpose of operating an airborne television service at a very low cost depends on whether the leadership in the Midwest region has the inventiveness to develop a new type of educational cooperation among school districts—a system of co-operation that allows them to provide themselves with a service that they would otherwise not be able to afford. Before we can really utilize the basic research in the learning process, in administration, in finance, and in educational technology, it all must fit harmoniously within a political and a public-administration context. It must make sense in terms of our local control of education and our state responsibility for education. If we have the courage to do these things, to experiment freely, to finance such experimentation, and then to develop devices in public administration to help sustain them, then qualitatively we can take care of the large number of students who are going to be knocking at our doors for education.

●

The Inside Story of a Bright Child

By ALLEN BERGER

Mr. Berger is a high-school English teacher in Utica, New York.

IT IS wonderful to observe the growing attention being focused upon the problems of the bright child, to discover all of the articles and books being written about him. But I wonder why so few are written from the child's viewpoint. What are his thoughts on the subject? Because it might be refreshing—and perhaps enlightening—to see the bright child in a new light, I have been presumptuous enough to write this article. I merely want the story to be told at least once from personal experience, instead of from the educator's theoretical point of view.

Like most children, I entered kindergarten when I was five—eighteen years ago. We had no tests of any kind there, so, of course, I have no way of knowing how I would have compared with the other children.

In the first or second grade, however, we began to have tests. I remember very clearly one in particular—it consisted of 101 of the simplest arithmetic problems. I was finished within a few minutes and all were correct, but I had to sit patiently in my seat for about a half hour until the last child was done. And that is the way it always was. We would have a test, I would finish first, and I would sit and wait.

The next thing that stands out very clearly in my mind is the time I skipped a semester: I went from the first half of the third grade to the first half of the fourth. This feat made me the youngest in the class, a distinction to be mine through grammar school.

And it was not long before I was again referred to as "the smartest kid in the room" and found myself sitting once again in the first seat, first row. All of the time I never did any more school work than I absolutely had to. That same year we took some sort of aptitude test to determine whether we were capable of doing fourth-grade work. According to my test results, I was capable of seventh-grade work.

At the end of that term, I was told that I was going to be double-promoted again. But after the principal and a few of my teachers held a private conference, they decided against my being advanced a second time, because they felt emotional problems might develop.

My reputation as the "brain" and "teacher's pet" became firmly established, and I came to hate it—for a very simple reason: because of it I was often made fun of by many of my classmates. By the time I was in the sixth grade, I thoroughly loathed being known as the smartest kid in the room, and I hated always to have to sit in the first seat, first row. This, to me, was not an honor seat, but the loneliest seat in the room.

So I decided to change. Taking the obvious course, I became the class comedian. And I was really funny: with a twist of a word, a turn of a phrase, I would set the class roaring. Spurred on by their laughter, I would devise new jokes, new ways of upsetting the class routine. And I enjoyed it—even though I was repeatedly kept after school and was forced to endure other punishments.

My plan was twofold, and it is the second part of which I am ashamed. But I must tell this part too, because it is most important.

I remember that whenever we had a spelling test, I would always misspell one or two words on purpose. And whenever we had an arithmetic test, I would always make a few "errors." That is what I am ashamed of—I cheated. I cheated myself in more ways than one might at first realize.

So that is the role I played during my last two years in grammar school. I was the class comedian, but I do not think that fact was really too important, if we may judge the importance of an act by its consequences. What was of prime importance was my lack of motivation to do the best I could. Because I did not want to be considered "different," I consciously, or perhaps subconsciously, slowed down my thought processes—with terrible consequences. By the time I graduated from grammar school, I had lost almost all my desire for learning; nonetheless, I still graduated among the top ten in the class.

During my first year in high school, I was somewhat surprised when I suddenly realized that I was no longer able to get an *A* whenever I wished. I was astonished when I realized that even when I did try my best, there were times when I did not get one. I had lost something, somewhere along the way, and I did not know what it was or where it was.

[*Continued on page 168*]

EDITORIAL COMMENT

ALTHOUGH the following letter was written in reference to a specific article appearing in the BULLETIN, the points made have application to research studies in general.

Letter to the Editor

It is only on the rarest of occasions that I find anything to complain about in your usually excellent journal; but the recent article by Frank M. Calabria, "Characteristics of Effective Teachers,"[1] is clearly an exception. Both as a research methodologist and a sometime worker in the area of teacher effectiveness, I find it hopelessly inadequate and misleading on a number of counts.

First, the study suffers from the lack of an adequate criterion of teaching effectiveness. The author reports that his subjects were drawn from a group nominated by certain secondary-school principals. He says, "Since what constitutes an effective teacher is subject to individual interpretation, the principals were asked also to indicate the criteria they used in making their nominations" (page 92). I fail to see how this latter action obviates the difficulties inherent in the fact that the actual nominations were made in terms of these "individual interpretations." Since no criteria were supplied by the author, we may assume that each principal made his choice on whatever basis tickled his fancy at that moment; the fact that he was required to make a verbal statement about what he *thought* guided his choice does not compensate for the variations in criteria from principal to principal. Indeed, judging from the author's report on the "most frequently mentioned qualities" (page 92), we can be quite certain the nominations were made on anything but comparable bases.

Second, the study lacks external validity. No study is of much value unless we know to whom the findings can be generalized. This knowledge does not come accidentally but must be planned for by carefully defining the population about which we wish to generalize and then selecting an appropriate probability sample from that population. Mr. Calabria has done neither of these things so far as one may judge from his report. Of course it may

[1] XXXIX (April 13, 1960), pp. 92–100.

be argued that the findings will apply to all groups which are like the group used in the study, but such argument is not only intellectually unsatisfying but relatively futile since there are no sound methods available for describing the parameters of this mythical population. It seems that this criticism of a lack of external validity is especially telling in this particular study because of its *normative* aspect: the purpose of the study is clearly to provide a *description* of effective teachers as a group. Perhaps the best that can be said here is that Mr. Calabria's procedures will yield a severely distorted picture of a group ambiguously defined in the first place.

Third, there is too much "deduction by inspection" rather than by application of rigorous tests. For example, in connection with Table 1 (page 94), the author asserts that "the distribution of effective academic teachers in New York State schools *appears* to approximate closely their proportional representation by subject area," and that "the teachers in this survey are *sufficiently representative* of effective academic teachers in New York State secondary schools" [italics mine]. A simple test which I performed to compare the data for English teachers in the survey sample with the state-wide distribution, using the author's tabled values, yielded a normal deviate approximating 3, a value well in excess of the 1-per cent significance value of 2.58.

Fourth, conclusions are implied which go beyond the data. In his formal concluding statements, the author sticks to facts reasonably well (although he presents no data which would tend to bear out his first conclusion). However, he suggests at the close that (a) mastery of subject matter is related to effectiveness, (b) long apprenticeships are necessary requisites to teaching effectiveness, and (c) effectiveness grows as a result of experience. Now these conclusions are inferences about *cause-effect* which are not tolerable in view of the particular experimental design employed—a design which does *not* permit any statement beyond the fact of mere statistical concomitance (I am reminded that Helen Walker has pointed out that "concomitance is a ubiquitous phenomenon"). It seems that an author has a responsibility toward his less sophisticated readers which ought to make him wary of thus "suggesting" conclusions which are in no sense validated by the data.

Fifth, the entire set of findings is relatively useless because there are no comparative data. This study is typical of what Donald Campbell has called a "One-Shot Case Study." As he points

out, "This design does not merit the title of experiment. . . . The very minimum of useful scientific information involves at least one formal comparison and therefore at least *two* careful observations" [italics mine].[2] Without at least one additional observation on a control group (for example, a group of *ineffective* teachers), we certainly are in no position to conclude anything from the data other than that they describe this particular group in this particular way at this particular time. We cannot be sure, for example, that the same findings would not have been obtained for *any* group of teachers. Perhaps we may make this clear by noting that the teachers of this sample probably also had hair, two eyes, and two hands, but we would obviously be very hesitant to say that these factors make teachers effective. The mere fact that the variables studied happen to be teaching-related does not obviate this difficulty one iota. Just because effective teachers have taken courses beyond the minimum requirement certainly does not mean that ineffective teachers have not taken such courses; this remains to be demonstrated. The point I am making here is most critical for this kind of study; in fact, it renders the findings absolutely meaningless, because we cannot interpret them *in relation* to anything else.

The social sciences, particularly education, are frequently criticized on the grounds that the research conducted within those fields is trivial and inept. Unfortunately this point of view can be far too well documented; the Calabria study is a prime example. Now I bear Mr. Calabria no malice, but it seems that we must stop carrying out and publishing studies of this kind which yield at best only very ambiguous, highly equivocal data. The sophisticated reader finds them worthless; the unsophisticated reader is entrapped by them; the professional critic of education finds in them yet another instance of the low level to which education has sunk. As a profession we cannot afford to permit very much more of this brand of inquiry.

EGON G. GUBA
Bureau of Educational Research and Service
Ohio State University

[2] "Factors Relevant to the Validity of Experiments in Social Settings," *Psychological Bulletin*, LIV (July, 1957), p. 298.

READINGS

Books to Read

HAVIGHURST, WALTER. *The Miami Years, 1809–1959.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958. 254 pp.

The author, research professor of English at Miami University, has written what journalists are wont to describe as a human-interest story. *The Miami Years* is an attempt to give life to the history of an educational institution established in 1809 as a center of learning in a frontier world. The University, or College as it was then, was created more out of hope and pride than out of a devoted interest in the cause of state-supported education. With sincerity and a touch of humor, Mr. Havighurst presents a picture of the trials and tribulations of "Old Miami" in its struggle to maintain students, faculties, and finances in what has come to be known as the "valley of democracy."

As Mr. Havighurst reveals, in the town of Oxford, Ohio, between 1824, the year the College opened its doors to students, and 1873, the year the Board of Trustees "resolved that instruction in the Collegiate Department be suspended" (page 133), higher education was not in tune with the spirit of a growing America.

Miami University, shorn of state support, had to drift for itself. It became an arm of the Presbyterian Church and dispensed classical teachings under the guidance of Presbyterian divines. As such, it became a conservative force for maintaining a tradition of collegiate learning and orthodox religion. Through the efforts of its presidents, faculty, and students, it served to fill the ranks of American leadership—a leadership brought up on Homer, Horace, and conic sections.

The real story in the book is of "Old Miami"; Mr. Havighurst's style unfortunately cannot keep pace with the growth of "New Miami." A modern school becomes too much a complex of buildings, programs, and deans to be a labor of love. The institution lends itself more to satire, as with Thurber, or to sociological analysis, as with Riesman, rather than to poetic vision. When Mr. Havighurst brings life to a building erected in 1818, when he lovingly describes Robert Hamilton Bishop, first president of Miami University, as "the rugged Scotchman [who] preached to frontier congregations in Kentucky and Southwestern Ohio," or when he paints a not too flattering picture of William Holmes McGuffey, the reader is drawn to the heart of an institution which was both a part of and a distant relation to the frontier. But the same style used to report the simple fact that in 1952 "for eight weeks Miami was host to a group of foreign teachers observing American institutions" (page 230) begins to sound like an item in the woman's pages of a small-town newspaper.

Yet this criticism is not meant to convey that Mr. Havighurst did not succeed in what he started out to do—namely, to breathe life and feeling into an institution which had its roots in the American frontier. He did succeed in making conspicuous the story of a school which has as its motto, *Prodesse Quam Conspici*—Accomplishment Rather Than Conspicuousness.

BERNARD MEHL

HUNNICUTT, C. W., AND IVERSON, WILLIAM J., editors. *Research in the Three R's.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958. xviii + 446 pp.

Elementary education has, for many years, offered a fertile field for research and experimentation not only in the basic subjects but also in the many related areas of the school. In fact, the studies are so numerous and so extensive that it is almost impossible to locate them in scientific journals and periodicals, let alone grasp their significance. Therefore, the editors of this excellent book have rendered a distinct service to all school persons in bringing together research in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and then organizing the material in an interesting and readable form. Furthermore, the period covered, extending from 1917 to 1953, is generally recognized as a time of great research activity in American education.

One of the interesting features of the book is found in the table of contents, where, instead of dull chapter headings, the editors have placed their own questions and statements which serve as titles. For example, under "The First 'R' " appear "Why We Read," "What Do People Read?" and "What Reading Does to People." Under "The Third 'R' " appear "Insight versus Connectionism—The Role of Drill" and "What and When in Arithmetic." These headings indicate the controversial status of many areas of knowledge in the elementary school which can be settled satisfactorily only by more and more careful research. Each chapter has subdivisions and subtitles which facilitate the location of material.

But the most valuable part of the book is to be found in the footnotes, which give the original sources for the material reported, together with the investigator's name, title of the article, and other facts of publication. Thus the reader's attention is directed to previously published materials which the editors have abstracted or abridged. Too often persons writing theses or doing other research do not know how to find original sources and, therefore, seem content with secondary sources. In fairness, however, one must admit that all too often the primary sources are obscured or appear in little known journals, and often the beginner does not know how to judge a publication of worth from one of lesser quality.

In addition to the research worker, the classroom teacher who has learned to consult objective evidence for some of her practices will be strengthened and encouraged in her endeavors; and she may be stimulated to conduct further research in her own classroom. This was a part of good teaching long before the slogan "action research" was coined. Whatever

the teacher's immediate purpose, if she wants scientific information in three of the basic subject areas of the elementary school, this book answers a specific and definite need.

To refute the current wave of criticism involving every aspect of elementary education, the presentation of research evidence in place of personal opinion (often expressed in terms of "When I was in the first grade we learned the alphabet," or "When we studied arithmetic we always added up the column") is of inestimable value. When the evidence of research is presented, good intention is lifted above the "pooling of ignorance" which so often results in heated arguments for which there are no answers.

While the editors admit to some bias in the selection of the materials included, this seems an overly modest attitude. Since both editors have had long careers in the theories and practices of good elementary education, presumably their judgments are sound. This is an excellent book for the student in this field who finds his interests and his services in research, in classroom teaching, in administration, in supervision, or in curriculum building.

RUTH STREITZ

TRAVERS, ROBERT M. W. *An Introduction to Educational Research.* New York: Macmillan Company, 1958. xx + 466 pp.

This book, which is somewhat modest in its claims, is not just another addition to the growing collection of introductory volumes on research techniques. Mr. Travers' treatment of the subject goes beyond the presentation of various recipes for thesis writing. The emphasis seems more suggestive than directive in that " . . . it cannot teach him [the reader] how to be an educational scientist. . . . by discussing the methods some scientists use, a book of this kind can suggest useful techniques for arriving at scientific knowledge (page 3).

The author's purpose is to interpret the work of the researcher in education for consumers of educational research as well as for beginners in research. In writing to this purpose, he has done well. His descriptions of methodological techniques are lucid, and he is quite successful in pointing out certain pitfalls in educational research. The student will not find reason to complain about the number and quality of exercises provided for his practice—both are ample.

However, in viewing the researcher in education as a specialist (not as a teacher doing research) whose function is to bring about "the transition of theory from a folklore status to a scientific status" (page 13), Mr. Travers presents a principle which may well defeat his purpose. Surely those who do research should know what they are about, but to separate this function from teaching and learning—the heart of the educational endeavor—is to run the great risk of developing a beautifully consistent theory which, nonetheless, is virtually free of the contact with the learning

process that teaching affords. Such a viewpoint will certainly enable the educational researcher to remain "outside" that which he observes; but as he does so successfully, his findings become sterile of what actually does occur within the teaching-learning process.

In pointing a finger at Mr. Travers' view of the research specialist in education, I am, no doubt, revealing to some degree my own concerns about theory construction in education and the function of philosophy in its construction. My disquietude seems to be somewhat warranted, however, because of the author's sixty-eight page discussion of scientific methodology and the place of philosophy in relation to it. The chill these pages bring is not thawed by the statement that "the philosopher and the scientist must surely work closely together on educational problems" (page 6); the philosopher is not a specialist in research, and experience reveals that the specialist has little patience with the philosopher who sees beyond his particular specialty.

GEORGE S. MACCIA

McMURRAY, HELEN B. *Personnel Services in Catholic Four Year Colleges for Women.* Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1958. ix + 177 pp.

This book, originally a doctoral dissertation, surveys the personnel services provided at four-year Catholic colleges for women. The important points may be found in the traditional dissertation chapters of summary, conclusions, and recommendations. The phases discussed are orientation services; housing and board; religious guidance; discipline and student activities; counseling services; vocational guidance, occupational placement, and academic services; financial aid to students; and health services.

In each instance the author presents the data collected from the several colleges and points to the conclusions that may be drawn. These are generally clear-cut and certainly supported by the data. Recommendations for change and improvement are also made for each type of service. Although many of the recommendations reflect sound personnel practices, some are of interest mainly as reflections of philosophy and aims of the Catholic Church.

The dissertation has been precisely presented. It may be expected, however, to appeal only to a limited audience.

GEORGE F. WOOSTER

PRESCOTT, DANIEL A. *Factors That Influence Learning.* Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1958. 78 pp. (Horace Mann Lecture Series, 1958).

This small book contains the Horace Mann Lecture given at the University of Pittsburgh in 1958. The avowed purposes of this lecture were: to "describe the factors which research has shown to be causative in human learning and development," to "state some generalizations about the educative process that seem to be implied by these research findings," and to

"illustrate ways in which a teacher can work with a child, already emotionally disturbed by inappropriate educational methods, plus other factors, to re-activate his confidence in himself and his own inner dynamic to learn and develop" (pages 4–5).

This is a broad undertaking indeed, and one not likely to be handled satisfactorily by one lecture. However, the author does succeed in making a number of points which seem essential to the understanding of the learning and developmental processes.

Like many contemporary behavioral scientists, Mr. Prescott clearly recognizes the need for an interdisciplinary approach in the understanding of human learning, development, and adjustment. Thus, references are frequently made to the need to consider findings from anthropology, biology, sociology, psychology, sociometry, pediatrics, and psychiatry.

Besides stressing the complex and interactional nature of the learning process, the author discusses briefly factors like cultural influences, emotional variables, health, growth, aptitude, security, and peer-group belonging and standing. In order to illustrate many of the points made in previous sections of the book and to demonstrate concretely the implementation of his "human development theory of learning," he presents a rather detailed and anecdote-laden case study.

Although Mr. Prescott gives evidence of considerable breadth of knowledge concerning relevant research in the biological and social sciences, this material is presented on a very low level. With respect to its relevance for public-school teachers, the intended audience, the material seems to be a rehash of notions presented in formal course work. For the serious scholar, on the other hand, it is lacking in the depth or documentation required of scientific treatises. Little support is given for the development of a formal theory. The "human development theory of learning" consists merely of a set of variables presumed to be pertinent to learning and adjustment. The author scarcely touches upon the relational aspects of the variables and the specification of criteria for testing his hunches.

Because much of the material has been covered in greater detail elsewhere, it is likely that scholars and students in education will gain little enlightenment from this work.

REGINALD JONES
Miami University

SYMONDS, P. M. *What Education Has to Learn from Psychology.* New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958. vi + 74 pp.

Notwithstanding the presumptuous title of this series of papers, there is a great deal of merit in the research-based principles that Symonds offers the practitioners of education. Psychology, though a young science, is rapidly growing into a sophisticated member of the scientific society with a vast treasure of facts and principles which can enrich numerous disciplines.

The main emphasis of this series is on the variables that affect learning. Of central importance is motivation. Symonds stresses the need for acceptance and approval as the motivating force of most human learning. But we do not learn, motivated or not, by merely being exposed to material through a lecture or reading assignment. We learn material when we *do* something with it—talk about it, recite it, think about it, apply it, and so forth. The implication is clear: when the teacher lectures and the student listens, there is only one person learning—the teacher.

However, the active and motivated student still may not learn unless his activity is rewarded. The teacher's most effective reward is acceptance and approval. Threats and punishment are not adequate techniques of promoting learning because they can have a detrimental effect upon the process.

Symonds, in a style that is entertaining as well as scholarly, carefully outlines the research on which these principles are based. One is left with the impression that they are well supported.

Unfortunately the author neglects many areas of psychology which contribute to education. The principles of development and individual differences; the numerous intelligence, attitude, and personality tests; and the group studies of Lewin and his followers are not mentioned. For a series of papers that pretend to be inclusive, these omissions are rather serious. With these limitations in mind, however, the series of papers can be read with profit by practicing teachers, school administrators, and anyone else who is interested in placing education on a scientific basis.

EMIL F. HEERMANN

NATIONAL MANPOWER COUNCIL. *Work in the Lives of Married Women; Proceedings of a Conference on Womanpower.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1958. xii + 220 pp.

The proceedings of a conference on the employment of married women outside the home make up the contents of this book. The title is a misnomer since the concern is not in any way with "work in the lives of married women," unless they happen to be among that minority who work outside the home. This is the seventh in a series of volumes resulting from the work of the National Manpower Council, the second dealing specifically with women in the labor force.

In addition to two introductory addresses, the book is divided into four parts: "Education, Training, and Guidance of Women for Reentry into the Labor Force," "The Utilization of Womanpower," "Income Earned by Married Women," and "Working Mothers and the Development of Children." Each part consists of one or more addresses and a summary of the conference discussion. Finally there is a ten-page summary of the "Conference Findings," which, perhaps, is the most balanced treatment of this much discussed subject which one will find in the plethora of literature.

In evaluating this book, one must begin with the trite but always significant observation that symposiums are inherently uneven in many respects. This one is no exception to the general rule. It is better than most, however, because the inclusion of the conference discussions and conference findings, in many ways the best material in the book, do a great deal to offset the difficulties often found.

Books which deal with problems involving fundamental changes in established social relationships are also difficult to evaluate because the values implied, possibly subconsciously, may warrant more discussion than those dealt with overtly. The conference apparently did not question the inevitability or the inherent morality of married women with children devoting themselves to full-time employment outside the home. Even when questions of the welfare of children were raised, one senses a compulsion on the part of the speakers to reassure everybody that the old-fashioned concern about children under these circumstances is really rather naïve. Obviously some makeshifts are better than others, and some children find them less demoralizing than others do; but these considerations hardly touch the fundamental issue, both moral and expedient, whether parents, except in extreme circumstances, have the moral right to subcontract parenthood. At one point the report did say ". . . whether this development is to be judged good or bad inevitably arose. . . . this question invited judgments of value and assertions . . . which were beyond the scope of the conference" (page 125)—perhaps beyond the scope of the conference, but not of the subject.

Probably one of the best parts of this book has to do with problems of utilization, guidance, and training of women who may be returning to the labor force after an absence.

JOHN F. CUBER

MOUSTAKAS, CLARK E. *The Alive and Growing Teacher.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. 158 pp.

Mr. Moustakas, of the Merrill-Palmer School of Detroit, is experienced both as an educator and a therapist. In this book he presents actual recordings of teachers' discussions on everyday problems in public schools. These discussions, which took place in a friendly and relaxed atmosphere, are used as examples to show how such an atmosphere is conducive to revealing the difficulties in classroom teaching as related to the teacher, the children, and the parents.

The recordings have been carefully selected to illustrate a theory of human relations. It is hoped that they

> . . . will stimulate further exploratory research into the process of personal growth, the emotional climate required in significant learning, the value of personal inquiry in group experience, the dimensions of human relations, and the nature of teaching and learning (Preface).

Topics considered are: "Growth of the Self"; "The Process of Personal Growth"; "The Teacher's Expression of Self in Relations with Other Teachers," ". . . with Children," ". . . with Parents"; "Spelling Contests, Grades, Praise and Punishment"; "A Return to the Self . . ."; "The Teacher Becomes a Learner"; and "Some Outcomes of the Process of Self-Growth in Teachers."

Although the recordings are self-explanatory, they are introduced and followed by comments and summaries which point out significant ideas. The material in the book is further strengthened by bibliographies at the ends of many chapters.

ESTHER MCGINNIS

Training for Social Work: Third International Survey. New York: United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 1958. viii + 350 pp.

This book was written because the literature on social-work methodology is limited to certain parts of the world. Training for social work as it is beginning to emerge internationally and suggestions for improving this training are the main topics of discussion. The contents are probably most applicable to countries just starting educational programs for the training of social workers. The book may well be most valuable to those countries where organized social welfare services are supplied mainly by the government which also employs the workers.

One of the difficulties in clarifying the components of social work is that it seeks to claim for itself a field of knowledge in which most people consider themselves experts. This book is organized to give a brief historical background of the nature of social work, a detailed presentation of the training for social work, and the educational objectives and methods in effective curriculum planning. Information concerning the curriculum was obtained from a survey of existing schools of social work throughout the world.

Through teaching, a social worker learns the skills of the profession not only in the school but also in actual work experience in an agency where he is assigned. Unfortunately, field experience at present is still too largely at the apprentice level. The need for close co-operation between school and agency is pointed out, as well as the necessity for the integration of what has been learned in the classroom and in actual practice.

Although there is at present a great deal of specialized instruction in schools of social work, there is still a real need for generic teaching which requires wider knowledge on the part of the instructor. Experience has shown that beginning social workers enter one type of setting for their first assignments and often find themselves in quite different situations on subsequent jobs.

The future development of social work can come only as a result of steadily building a body of tested knowledge which would be available

to be taught in the various professional schools. This well-written book, the first of its kind at an international level, will be a welcome and valuable resource for many countries in the development of their own social work–education programs.

WILLIAM D. LAKIN

The Inside Story of a Bright Child

[*Continued from page 156*]

I graduated from high school in the top one-sixth of my class and went on to college. It was a big jump, and I did not make it the first time. But I came back to try again. This time I was successful, and I graduated three years ago with a respectable scholastic record.

LEST there be any misunderstanding, I will add a few more relevant facts. I grew up in a middle-class neighborhood in upstate New York and went to one of the best grammar schools in the city. Although many persons are under the impression that bright children are physically inferior to children of average intelligence, this certainly was not true in my case. As a child I participated in almost every sport. For five consecutive summers —from 1948 through 1952—I played baseball with a championship team in the Kiwanis League. In 1953, during my senior year in high school, I was one of the fastest 100 and 220 yard–dash men in New York State.

That is all I have to say. I know that what happened to me is typical of what happens to many bright children as they are forced to plod through the machinery of our public-school system. Thanks to Sputnik, much attention is now being focused upon this problem. But so much still must be done, and swiftly—not merely for the bright child's sake, but for America's sake as well.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

OF THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND
THE BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SERVICE

Social Status and Leadership: The Case of the School Executive.

By MELVIN SEEMAN. Educational Research Monographs, Number 35. xiv + 149 pp. 1960. $4.00, cloth; $3.00, paper.

In this study the author examines leadership in the schools by using rigorous empirical techniques but interpreting his data in broad terms.

The College of Education Style Manual. Revised Edition.

By SHIRLEY LIPSON AND ANNE W. ABRAMS. vi + 18 pp. 1960. 25 cents.

This new edition expands much of the information found in the original Manual. It is intended primarily for use in preparing the research paper, but a substantial portion is devoted to rules of capitalization and punctuation. High-school students may find many of the suggestions useful.

Conflicting Ideas in Teacher Education.

By N. V. SCARFE. The Boyd H. Bode Memorial Lectures, 1959. viii + 40 pp. 1960.

The dean of the College of Education at the University of British Columbia discusses "What Is Good Teaching?" and "The Principles of Teacher Education." He comments particularly on the usefulness of educational television.

"I Can Read It Myself!" Some Books for Independent Reading in the Primary Grades.

By FRIEDA M. HELLER. Study of Independent Reading, Bulletin 1. iv + 31 pp. $1.00.

The librarian of the Ohio State University School has prepared an annotated list of books arranged according to three levels of difficulty.

✓ ✓ ✓

Orders should be addressed to Publications Office, Ohio State University, 242 W. 18th Avenue, Columbus 10, Ohio.